

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' MILLENNIAL STAR.

*He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.—Jesus Christ.
Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her
plagues.—A Voice from Heaven.*

No. 25, Vol. XIX.

Saturday, June 20, 1857.

Price One Penny.

ANTI-MORMON OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

BY HENRY WHITTALL.

Continued from page 383.

OBJECTIONS: "It does appear that the Mormonites do attach too much importance to their being baptized; and, if we may judge from their avowed principles and practice, they seem to imagine that it will operate as a charm. Baptism is only a sign, and not the thing signified; and many are baptized who are only baptized infidels. Without the renewal of the heart, a religious profession will be of no avail. The rite of baptism cannot save: 'circumcision availeth nothing, neither uncircumcision, but a new creature.' This doctrine was plainly taught by our Lord and his Apostles, and it is that which is essential to our becoming true Christians; for except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Every institution of God ought to be observed by us in the manner prescribed, and not to substitute it for the regeneration of the heart by the Spirit. This is a radical defect in the system of the Book Mormon. It is a dangerous error, and will be manifest in the lives of all who are under its influence."—*"Mormonism Weighed," &c., by S. Haining.*

"Mormonism teaches that salvation chiefly depends on what is outward—connection with its communion, and

baptism by immersion or dipping. Without these things, it says, there can be no salvation. The Bible, on the contrary, shows and teaches that such outward things are in *themselves* of no value, and that faith in Christ, and a change of heart, which are *internal* things, are the essential matters in salvation. 'For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision (which answers to baptism under the New Testament) availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love.' (Gal. v. 6.) 'For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.' (Gal. v. 15.) The dying thief was saved without baptism; and Simon the sorcerer was still in a lost state, although baptized.' (Acts viii. 23.) "Mormonism like Popery, professes to save men by the charm of its baptism, and by communion with itself. But God's word says that salvation never can be obtained by such means, but that it must be through faith in Christ, attended by a change of heart and life." (Gal. ii. 16.)—*"Mormonism an Imposture," by P. Drummond.*

ANSWER: With regard to the first objection, we have only to say that the Latter-day Saints attach no more

and no less importance to the ordinance of baptism than the Saviour and his Apostles attached to it. If it be possible for us, as Christians, to "attach too much importance" to the divine institutions of Christ, our opponents and their abettors will certainly be exonerated from the charge; but we fear they will stand guilty of attaching *too little* importance to them. This reminds us somewhat forcibly of the equally feeble objections urged by Naaman, the Syrian captain, against the Prophet Elisha's prescribed terms for the cure of his leprosy. The word of the Prophet was, "Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean." This was a simple remedy, but Naaman could not see the philosophy of it. It was too simple, too humbling to the pride of the "captain of the host of the king of Syria;" and he "was wroth and went away, and said, Behold, I thought He will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, and strike his hand over the place and recover the leper. Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them, and be clean? So he turned and went away in a rage. Afterwards, however, he relented, and went and "dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God; and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." But it is evident that, before he could possess the desired and promised blessing, he had to comply with the prescribed conditions. Had he dipped a thousand times in a Damascus river, or less than seven times in Jordan, he would not have been cleansed from his leprosy; but as soon as he attached sufficient "importance" to the word of Elisha as to obey it, behold, the promised blessing came. We leave our Anti-Mormon objectors to draw the parallel. They may, if so determined, ragingly denounce the simplicity of the Gospel, and spurn its gracious overtures; but we are not willing to follow their example. We will not risk our hopes of salvation, and wilfully incur our Lord's displeasure, by despising or slighting His holy ordinances; for they who know their Master's will, and do it not, will be punished with many stripes. If there is any "charm" in yielding obedience to the Gospel-law, let us have it.

If it will "operate" in any way beneficially, let us experience its operations; and our anti-christian foes are welcome to the pleasure and gratification of mocking and deriding us. We are bent upon obtaining life—eternal life—which is so freely offered to us in the Gospel: we are resolved and determined—God being our helper—upon yielding implicit obedience to the requirements and institutions of that Gospel; and in doing this we care not for the scoffs and ridicule of the sectarian world. We neither court its smiles nor fear its frowns. We know in whom we believe, and happily possess that knowledge of the truth, that anchor of hope, that assurance of faith, and that indescribable peace and joy in believing, which the world can neither give nor ever take away. Our first objector views baptism as "only a sign," but does not say of what. It may, indeed, in its proper time and place, be regarded as an "outward and visible sign" of the believer's *obedience*—as an external act significative of the penitent believer's willingness to fulfil the law of Christ, which is the Gospel. But when administered otherwise, and without legal authority, as is the case in all pædobaptist and other churches of sectarians, it is "only a sign" of folly and presumption. It may be true that "many are baptized who are only baptized infidels." In fact, all who are baptized without having true faith in Christ, are little else than "baptized infidels," whatever christian profession they may make. Faith in Christ implies faith in him as the Divinely-commissioned Teacher of mankind, and therefore involves faith in the entire system of Christianity—faith in all the principles of Divine truth which Christ taught, and which his inspired servants taught in his name. The professing Christian world ostensibly acknowledge Him, but at the same time reject one-half of His teachings. They profess to believe the Gospel of Christ, but yet disregard many of its prominent features. Such characters may indeed be formally baptized, but their baptisms will be of no avail, for it is impossible that they can be followed by the baptism of the Spirit; and "except a man be born of water AND the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." It is undoubtedly true, as our opponent says, that "without the renewal of the heart, a religious profession will be of no avail;" but let it be also remembered that where

there is truly a "renewal of the heart," there will be a hearty and unreserved concurrence in all the requirements of the Gospel—an humble willingness and determination to obey that Gospel in all its principles and ordinances. Our objector, however, adds, "The rite of baptism cannot save;" and certainly no one will venture to affirm that it either can or will save, of itself, unaccompanied by faith and repentance. But this much we can with safety declare, on the testimony of Holy Writ, that, as an ordinance of that Gospel which is "the power of God unto salvation to them that believe," it is an indispensable Christian duty, and a necessary condition of salvation. It is one link in that Gospel chain which, in the hand of Christ, is long enough to reach, and strong enough to save, "even to the uttermost," all who are willing to "come unto God" thereby. But break even that one link, and the chain as a whole is broken. As a Gospel principle, therefore, baptism is a *saving* principle. "He that believeth AND IS BAPTIZED, shall be SAVED:" so says the Saviour. (Mark xvi. 16.) The Apostle Peter also declares in the plainest terms, "The like figure whereunto even BAPTISM doth now SAVE us." (1 Peter iii. 21.) It is undeniably true, as both our objectors remind us, that "in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision." Circumcision forms no part of the Christian law, and is therefore unavailable to us; but what has that to do with the obligations of Christian baptism? It does not follow, because Jewish circumcision is not binding on Christians, that therefore Christian baptism is not. Does baptism avail nothing? Why, then, was it instituted?—why taught as a Gospel, saving ordinance? Was it not instituted expressly for the remission of sins?—and is that nothing?—will that avail nothing? Out of order, and under improper circumstances, we grant that it would be unavailing; but that is not the point. We gladly and willingly admit the scriptural fact that "a new creature" is "essential to our becoming true Christians," for "this doctrine was plainly taught by our Lord and his Apostles." And what is a "new creature?" It is one who has ceased to do evil, and learned to do well,—one who has put away all his old erroneous traditions, and evil habits, and has commenced a new life of righ-

teousness, and obedience to the revelations of God as given through His authorized servants;—one who has abandoned all human creeds and man-made systems, and has bowed in obedience to the Gospel of Christ,—one whose principles of *true faith* and *genuine repentance* are verified in his every-day life and conduct, who has *received the remission of his sins*, (by the death of Christ,) through the symbolic ordinance of baptism; and who has *received the gift of the Spirit*, through the sealing ordinance of confirmation, on the laying-on of hands. With a view of showing the inutility and unavailableness of Christian baptism, one of our objectors cites the text, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." So, indeed, said the Saviour to Nicodemus; but as our objector, Nicodemus-like, appears to have misunderstood the import of the words, we refer him to the Saviour's own paraphrase, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." What, then, is being "born of water," but the emersion of the penitent believer from the watery tomb or womb into a new condition or phase of life and character, with his sins remitted, or washed away, when he commences to live in a new position before God, under a new and everlasting covenant of grace? And what is being born "of the Spirit," but the going forth of the baptized, penitent believer, thus released from the load of past sins, into a higher sphere of *spiritual* life, under the special influence of the Holy Spirit of promise, sealed and confirmed upon him by the ordinance of the laying-on of hands? We heartily reciprocate and endorse the sentiment, that "Every institution of God ought to be observed by us in the manner prescribed," and also that we should not "substitute it for the regeneration of the heart by the Spirit," or for anything else. It is not, however, the Latter-day Saints who "substitute" baptism for other matters of either great or less importance. It is not the "Mormons," so called, who disregard the ancient institution of the Lord, and "substitute" for it the modern inventions of men. God forbid it. We endeavour, in the fullest sense, to "observe" that sacred ordinance "in the manner prescribed" by Jesus and his Apostles, and can with confidence appeal to the Scriptures for the truthfulness of our baptismal doctrine and

practice. To say that the substitution of baptism for the regeneration of the heart is "a radical defect in the Book [of] Mormon," is to say that which is not true, for the Book of Mormon inculcates no such dogma as our opponent would attribute to it. The statement, also, of the second objector, that "Mormonism" teaches that salvation chiefly depends on what is *outward*, &c. is also false and unfounded. "Mormonism" teaches nothing of the kind. It teaches that salvation depends entirely upon our obedience to ALL the requirements of the Gospel, both internal and external—implicit and unreserved obedience to "EVERY word of God" given to us through His recognised and appointed channel. It is not for us to dictate terms, and say this is essential, and that is non-essential, according to the caprice of our fancy, or the bent of our personal inclinations. There are by far too many Naamans in the professing Christian world, who object to this point, dislike that—reject with disdain one principle, and laugh to scorn another, and would fain accomplish their salvation in their own way, according to the dictates of their own imagination and will. This is, indeed, the principle on which mankind have been acting for many centuries. Is the Gospel of modern ages like the pure Gospel of old? Alas, no. Men have violated its obligations, corrupted and perverted its original features, and shorn it of its ancient glory and power. We, of course, readily grant that "outward things are *in themselves* of no value." But does it follow that they are of "no value when in their proper connection with other principles of true religion?" It will be admitted on all hands that "faith in Christ, and a change of heart, which are *internal* things," are to be regarded, in the fullest sense of the words, as "essential matters in salvation." But that does not destroy or in any way militate against the fact that Christian baptism is, in its place, "essential," as a divinely-instituted ordinance of the Gospel. Of course, the mere "outward" act of immersing the body in water is, *in itself*, considered apart from its sacramental import, of no more "value" than common bathing; but when regarded as a special, voluntary act of obedience to the Gospel requirements, the aspect of the case changes, and what would otherwise appear a mere meaningless form, becomes an evi-

dent, indispensable duty. There is no saving, spiritual virtue in the *water*. It is the faith and repentance that accompany the act of baptism which render it efficacious. The absolute necessity of the duty, as well as its sacramental efficacy and power, lie especially in the one great fact of its being of *Divine appointment*. Who, then, should dare to depreciate its "value," or presume to lessen its "importance?" Did not the Most High reveal it to the world as a saving ordinance, eighteen centuries ago, through His Son Jesus and His servants the Apostles? He did; and who shall gainsay it? In these last days the original Gospel is again revealed to the world in its fullness, and integrity, and power, through the Divinely-commissioned Apostle and Prophet Joseph Smith; and those who have so long made void the law of God by their own traditions—those who have so long set at nought the initiatory ordinances of salvation, and substituted for them the commandments of men—those who have ignored the revelations of heaven, "sought out many inventions" and set up many systems in lieu thereof, have now an opportunity of ceasing to go astray, of returning to the old path, and walking in that strait and narrow way that leadeth to eternal life. An idea is parenthetically introduced by our second objector, that the rite of circumcision "answers to baptism under the New Testament," meaning, we presume, that the latter takes the place of the former, and was prefigured by it; and hence he strangely argues, (inferentially,) that as to us "circumcision availeth nothing," so baptism is of no avail! But the fact is, in reality, that Jewish circumcision and Christian baptism are ordinances of a distinct, independent, and dissimilar nature, and were instituted under widely different circumstances, and for entirely different purposes: consequently, instead of the one answering to the other, and being superseded by it, there is no connexion whatever between them. Indeed the essential dissimilarity of the two ordinances is, in every feature, so great and self-evident, that the idea of instituting a typical comparison and correspondence between them would not for a moment be entertained by any candid Scripture student, but for want of a more rational support for the unscriptural theory of infant baptism. Circumcision was a seal

of the national covenant which God made with Abraham and his posterity, through the line of Isaac and Jacob; whereas baptism is of universal application, obligatory upon Christian believers of every kindred, tongue, and people. Circumcision was performed upon babes, eight days old; whereas baptism was designed only for persons capable of exercising faith and repentance, and was instituted for the remission of sins, of which infants are incapable. Circumcision was performed on males only; but baptism is administered to both sexes. Circumcision, in the time of the Apostles, though not imposed upon Gentile Christians, (see Acts xv. 22—29,) was nevertheless performed upon the children of Jewish Christians. (See Acts xxi. 18—25.) Paul even circumcised "a certain disciple," Timothy, whose father was a Greek, but his mother a Christian Jewess. (Acts xvi. 1—4.) There will be found, on investigation, ample proof of the non-connection of the two distinct ordinances of circumcision and baptism. How great, then, and how evident is the fallacy of our opponent's assumption, that the one "answers," to the other! If baptism is in place of circumcision, supercessory to it, and represented by it, as paedobaptists assume, why were the children of Jewish Christians circumcised, by Apostolic authority? and why did an "Apostle of the Gentiles" circumcise a young man who, in all probability, had already been baptized? Why, also, it may be asked, do professing Christians disregard the supposed type, by sprinkling their daughters as well as their sons, and that, too, at all ages indiscriminately? The nature and purport, and essential peculiarities of the separate ordinances are entirely overlooked; and, for want of some sort of excuse or apology, however trifling, the eye—blind to all other features of the case—rests fixedly and contentedly upon the one simple, bare outline fact, that Jewish infants were circumcised!—and upon this slight and slender basis professing Christians take upon themselves, without authority, and in defiance of the Gospel law, to administer what they call "baptism" to their unconscious babes! With regard to "the dying thief," we would ask our opponent whence he derived his information that he was saved without baptism? How knows he that he had not been baptized? Some critical writers

affirm their belief that, though called in our version a thief, he was only a political offender, and had been a disciple of Jesus. His ejaculation, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom," would certainly appear to betoken an intimate acquaintance with Jesus and his teachings. But, apart from this view of the case, and supposing that he had not been baptized at all, we would ask, how knows our objector that "the dying thief was saved?" His own (imaginary) ground for this idea is the answer of Jesus, "Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Where, then, was "paradise?" It was, without doubt, where Jesus went to on that day. And where was that? Was it to heaven, in the presence of his Father? No; for Jesus himself declared after his resurrection, "I am not yet ascended to my Father." (John xx. 17.) His body had been lying in the tomb; and, according to the testimony of the Apostle Peter, his spirit "went and preached unto the spirits in prison," who had lived in the flesh in "the days of Noah." (1 Peter iii. 18—20.) Here, then, was the spirit of "the dying thief," with Jesus. We need not enter into a lengthy disquisition upon the meaning of "paradise." The necessary point is arrived at—that, at all events, it was not heaven. And "the dying thief" appears to have known that Christ's "kingdom" was to "come" (on the earth) at a future period. Hence his prayer, "Lord, remember me, WHEN thou COMEST into thy kingdom." That "kingdom" is now being set up, preparatory to the coming of our "Lord, when "the dying thief" will doubtless have the fulfilment of his desire and prayer. It is lamentably true, as our objector states, that "Simon the Sorcerer was still in a lost state, although baptized;" and this is only an instance of the truth of what we have so often reiterated, that baptism, unless preceded and accompanied by genuine faith and repentance, is of no avail before God, and of no benefit to man. Whatever "Popery" may do, "Mormonism" does NOT profess to "save men by the charm of its baptism," nor by any outward "communion with itself." A man, Simon Magus-like, may be baptized in water, and be in external communion with the Church of God, and yet, with all his "baptism" and "communion," go down to perdition. "Salvation," we know right well, "never

can be obtained by such means" alone. We also believe, and know, and continually teach, that "it must be through faith in Christ, attended by a change of heart and life." And what does that "faith in Christ" include? It includes, necessarily, faith in the entire system of Divine truth which Christ taught. And what does "a change of heart and life" imply? It implies a renewal of the whole man, with all his affections, and desires, and

principles of action; it comprehends a full and unreserved acceptance of the Gospel covenant, a hearty and willing obedience to all its requirements, and a discharge of all the duties of the Christian life. This is what "Mormonism" teaches. This—let our enemies say what they may—is the "pure and undefiled religion" of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

(To be continued.)

HISTORY OF JOSEPH SMITH.

(Continued from page 376.)

[April, 1842.]

Friday, 29th. A conspiracy against the peace of my household was made manifest, and it gave me some trouble to counteract the design of certain base individuals, and restore peace. The Lord makes manifest to me many things, which it is not wisdom for me to make public, until others can witness the proof of them.

Saturday, 30th. I received a visit from Judge Adams, of Springfield, and spent most of the day with him and my family. Signed deeds to James and Charles Ivins, and many others.

Sunday, May 1st, 1842. I preached in the grove, on the Keys of the Kingdom, Charity, &c. The Keys are certain signs and words by which false spirits and personages may be detected from true, which cannot be revealed to the Elders till the Temple is completed. The rich can only get them in the Temple, the poor may get them on the mountain top as did Moses. The rich cannot be saved without charity, giving to feed the poor when and how God requires, as well as building. There are signs in heaven, earth, and hell; the Elders must know them all, to be endowed with power, to finish their work and prevent imposition. The devil knows many signs, but does not know the sign of the Son of Man, or Jesus. No one can truly say he knows God until he has handled something, and this can only be in the Holiest of Holies.

Monday, 2nd. Editorial of the *Times and Seasons*.

THE TEMPLE.—This noble edifice is progressing with great rapidity; strenuous exertions are being made on every hand to facilitate its erection, and materials of all kinds are in a great state of forwardness, and by next fall we expect to see the building enclosed; if not the top stone raised with "shouting of grace—grace unto it." There have been frequently, during the winter, as many as one hundred hands quarrying rock, while at the same time multitudes of others have been engaged in hauling, and in other kinds of labour.

A company was formed last fall to go up to the pine country to purchase mills, and prepare and saw lumber for the Temple and the Nauvoo House, and the reports from them are very favourable; another company has started, this last week, to take their place, and to relieve those that are already there; on their return they are to bring a very large raft of lumber, for the use of the above-named houses.

While the busy multitudes have thus been engaged in their several avocations performing their daily labour, and working one tenth of their time, others have not been less forward in bringing in their tithings and consecrations for the same great object. Never since the foundation of this Church was laid, have we seen manifested a greater willingness to comply with the requisitions of Jehovah, a more ardent desire to do the will of God, more strenuous exertions used, or greater sacrifices made than there have been since the Lord said, "Let the Temple be built by the tithing of my people." It seemed as though the spirit of enterprise, philanthropy and obedience rested simultaneously upon old and young, and brethren and sisters, boys and girls, and even strangers, who were not in the Church, united with an

unprecedented liberality in the accomplishment of this great work; nor could the widow, in many instances, be prevented, out of her scanty pittance, from throwing in her two mites.

We feel at this time to tender to all, old and young, both in the Church and out of it, our unfeigned thanks for their unprecedented liberality, kindness, diligence, and obedience which they have so opportunely manifested on the present occasion. Not that we are personally or individually benefitted in a pecuniary point of view, but when the brethren, as in this instance, show a unity of purpose and design, and all put their shoulder to the wheels, our care, labour, toil, and anxiety is materially diminished, "our yoke is made easy, and our burden is light."

The cause of God is one common cause, in which all the Saints are alike interested; we are all members of the one common body, and all partake of the same spirit, and are baptized unto one baptism, and possess alike the same glorious hope. The advancement of the cause of God and the building up of Zion is as much one man's business as another's. The only difference is, that one is called to fulfil one duty, and another, another duty; "but if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it, and if one member is honoured all the rest rejoice with it, and the eye cannot say to the ear, I have no need of thee, nor the head to the foot, I have no need of thee;" party feelings, separate interests, exclusive designs should be lost sight of in the one common cause, in the interest of the whole.

The building up of Zion is a cause that has interested the people of God in every age; it is a theme upon which Prophets, Priests, and Kings have dwelt with peculiar delight; they have looked forward with joyful anticipation to the day in which we live; and fired with heavenly and joyful anticipations they have sung, and wrote, and prophesied of this our day; but they died without the sight; we are the favoured people that God has made choice of to bring about the Latter-day Glory; it is left for us to see, participate in, and help to roll forward the Latter-day Glory, "the dispensation of the fulness of times, when God will gather together all things that are in heaven, and all things that are upon the earth, even in one," when the Saints of God will be gathered in one from every nation, and kindred, and people, and tongue, when the Jews will be gathered together into one, the wicked will also be gathered together to be destroyed, as spoken of by the Prophets; the Spirit of God will also dwell with His people, and be withdrawn from the rest of the nations, and all things whether in heaven or on earth will be in

one, even in Christ. The heavenly Priesthood will unite with the earthly, to bring about those great purposes; and whilst we are thus united in the one common cause, to roll forth the kingdom of God, the Heavenly Priesthood are not idle spectators; the Spirit of God will be showered down from above, it will dwell in our midst. The blessings of the Most High will rest upon our tabernacles, and our name will be handed down to future ages; our children will rise up and call us blessed; and generations yet unborn will dwell with peculiar delight upon the scenes that we have passed through, the privations that we have endured; the untiring zeal that we have manifested; the insurmountable difficulties that we have overcome in laying the foundation of a work that brought about the glory and blessings which they will realise; a work that God and Angels have contemplated with delight for generations past; that fired the souls of the ancient Patriarchs and Prophets; a work that is destined to bring about the destruction of the powers of darkness, the renovation of the earth, the glory of God, and the salvation of the human family.

Tuesday, 3rd. Mostly with my family.

Wednesday, 4th. I spent the day in the upper part of the Store, that is, in my private office (so called, because in that room I kept my sacred writings, translated ancient records, and received revelations) and in my general business office, or lodge room (that is, where the masonic fraternity met occasionally, for want of a better place) in council with General James Adams of Springfield, Patriarch Hyrum Smith, Bishops Newel K. Whitney, and George Miller, and Presidents Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Willard Richards, instructing them in the principles and order of the Priesthood, attending to washings, anointings, endowments, and the communication of Keys pertaining to the Aaronic Priesthood, and so on to the highest order of Melchisedec Priesthood, setting forth the order pertaining to the Ancient of Days, and all those plans and principles by which any one is enabled to secure the fulness of those blessings which have been prepared for the Church of the First Born, and come up and abide in the presence of the Eloheim in the eternal worlds. In this Council was instituted the ancient order of things for the first time in these last days. And the communications I made to this Council were of things spiritual, and to be received only

by the spiritual minded: and there was nothing made known to these men, but what will be made known to all the Saints of the last days, so soon as they are prepared to receive, and a proper place is prepared to communicate them, even to the weakest of the Saints; therefore let the Saints be diligent in building the

Temple, and all houses which they have been, or shall hereafter be commanded of God to build; and wait their time with patience in all meekness, faith and perseverance unto the end, knowing assuredly that all these things referred to, in this Council, are always governed by the principle of revelation.

To be continued.

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' MILLENNIAL STAR.

SATURDAY, JUNE 20, 1857.

THE LONDON "TIMES" AND THE "MORMONS."—The London *Times* of the 3rd instant, is in great ecstasies over the last batch of falsehoods, imported from America, concerning the "Mormons" of Utah. One would almost think, from the confidence with which the editor speaks, that he had really succeeded, at last, in getting hold of some reliable information against the peaceable citizens of that territory. It is, at least, very evident that he hopes the information is true; and labours hard to make his readers believe it, as something undoubted. It is rather unaccountable that a gentleman of so much apparent good sense as the editor of the *Times* appears to be, should be so shockingly deceived, time after time, with the most absurd and ridiculous stories about the inhabitants of Utah Territory. Not long since, he was unfortunately imposed upon by the reports of that shameless adulterer, Drummond, who ran away from the territory to escape the penalty of the law, which would have consigned him to the penitentiary. The wicked and most malicious falsehoods of this criminal scape-grace, having been disproved, and shown by the most incontestible evidence to be without the least foundation, the editor next hunts the American papers for something else, on which to feast his insatiable appetite. He soon discovers that the citizens of Utah had driven his Excellency Governor Young from their midst, and that he was now wandering an outcast among the wild Indians of the mountains. But finding this story also to be false, his craving for another, became almost insupportable, and might have proved fatal, if the last American mail had not furnished him with another sweet morsel. This time he thinks there is no deception. The Utonians, in his estimation, must certainly be in open rebellion. Should he be disappointed, in this last "forlorn hope," what will he do? It will undoubtedly go hard with him. But do not be discouraged, dear sir, the devil is not yet dead; and there are plenty more lies where the former ones came from. Your appetite can be fully satisfied. If they cannot manufacture them fast enough on the other side of the Atlantic, there are plenty of correspondents who can be employed close at home: only label their articles as if written in Utah, and they will be greedily swallowed.

We will now give our readers a few quotations from the *Times*, that they may see that the editor is either egregiously ignorant, or maliciously wicked in his representations of the government of Utah.

"Here is a whole territory, professing to be part and parcel of the great North American Republic, yet claiming the use of a moral and civil code of its own, totally different from that of the great community to which it belongs—a code which is simply a reversal of the religion and the civilization of eighteen centuries, and a recurrence to the savage state in politics, and to Paganism in morals."

Will the *Times* please inform its readers wherein the "civil code" of Utah is "totally different from that of the great community to which it belongs?" Wherein does it differ, in the least respect, from the codes or Republican forms by which the other territories of the American Union are governed? Is there one Law, or Act, or Resolution in the "civil code" of Utah, that is anti-Republican, or unconstitutional, or contrary, in the slightest degree, to the laws of the United States? If the "civil code" be "totally different," the *Times* will not find it a difficult matter to give its readers barely one specimen of its difference. We have been a member of the Legislative Council of that territory, during three of its Sessions, and assisted in the enactment of the "civil code" which was afterwards forwarded to Washington City, and received the approval of Congress; and we are not aware that there is one feature that either Congress or the Federal Courts have ever taken the least exception to. And we will venture to say that the editor of the *Times* never saw the "civil code" of Utah, and yet he has made the alarming discovery that it is "totally different from that of the great community to which" Utah belongs. What a pity it was that the *Times* did not enlighten Congress in regard to this total difference before they gave their entire approval. The *Times*, in the above extract, also accuses the territory of Utah, with having a "moral code" as well as a civil one. This is entirely untrue. No territory or State of the American Republic is permitted to have a moral or religious code in any way binding on its citizens. Utah as a territory, therefore, has no moral code, any more than Oregon or Kansas. Every religious denomination in Utah, as in all the other territories, adopts its own moral code, with which the civil code has nothing to do, so long as the citizens do not violate the latter. If the "Mormons," Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, or any other religious denomination in Utah, embrace a moral code which leads them to violate the laws or constitution of the General Government or the civil laws of Utah, then by the laws should they be judged and condemned. But, on the other hand, if none of the religious denominations in that territory violate any civil law, then they are free, and can believe as they please, and worship what they please, and adopt any moral code they please; and neither the Federal Courts, nor the General Government, nor anybody else, has any right to molest or interfere with them. This sentiment is conceded by the *Times* in the following:—

"You cannot interfere by force with people's morals. The United States would declare, as it did through the Federal Court of Utah, that monogamy was part and parcel of the law of the United States, and therefore that, if a man had married sixteen wives, fifteen of them were his mistresses, and their children illegitimate. But, having pronounced that judgment, the law could not prevent the other fifteen women from living with a man who called himself their husband, if they chose.

Here the *Times* is quite liberal, admitting that the law of the United States "could not prevent other fifteen women from living with a man who called himself their husband, if they chose." Here we ask the *Times*, which would be the most honorable, a law that would permit a man to live with "fifteen women" as "mistresses," and render "their children illegitimate," subject, at any time, to be thrown into the streets, houseless, penniless, and unprotected; or a law that would acknowledge the "fifteen women" as wives, render the children legitimate, and compel the husband to support both them and their children? Please forget not to answer this question, as it has a close bearing upon the "moral and civil code" of England. But the *Times* is entirely mistaken, if it supposes "monogamy" a "part and parcel of the law of the United States." The Federal Government has no law on the subject of marriage. So far as the law of the United States is concerned, it is just as lawful to have "sixteen wives" as to have one. And no "Federal Court of Utah" or of any

other territory or state, has declared otherwise. If "monogamy" be a "part and parcel of the law of the United States," the *Times* will greatly enlighten its readers by reference to the volume containing the Act.

But the *Times* is exulting in the last news from Utah.

"The last news from Utah is, that the Federal or United States' Court in the territory had been suppressed by an organized Mormonite force:—'While the Court was in progress on the 12th ult. the Mormon members of the bar and others of the Danite band inveigled Judge Styles into a private room, locked the door, barred the windows, and then, with revolvers at his head, and knives within an inch of his throat, forced him to promise to uphold them in whatever they did, and to sustain the laws of Utah.' The Judge submitted, and declared in Court the next day, that 'he should be governed by the laws of the territory in preference to all others.' And on Mr. BURN, the United States' Surveyor-General, getting up and formerly putting the question, whether this meant that the law of the United States was to be superseded, 'the whole audience sprang to their feet, and the Danite murderers, who filled the court, threw off their coats, brandished their knives and revolvers, and created so great a confusion that the Judge was obliged to dissolve the court.' The United States' Court, then, having been suppressed by force, and a formal act of rebellion against the Federal Government having been committed, it would appear that there was only one course for the Federal Government to take, and that that was to despatch a military force to Utah, suppress the present territorial Government, and carry on the laws by means of magistrates of Federal appointment, acting under the protection of the military, until such time as another territorial settlement could be effected. If the United States' Government is true to itself it can have no choice in the matter, because the very principle of the Federation is defied by this Mormonite Act."

Why did not the *Times* inform its readers who the author was, that reported such great news from Utah? Ah! that is a question difficult to be answered. The Utah news was probably manufactured in the States, by some unknown correspondent, to excite the public, and put coppers into the pockets of editors, at the expense of the peaceful unoffending citizens of Utah. In the first place, there never has been in fellowship among the "Mormons," either a secret or public band called "Danites," or by any other name; but this is a false and slanderous accusation, originated about twenty years ago, by Missouri murderers, to justify themselves in butchering men, women, and children; and the same wicked malicious lie has been kept up by our persecutors, from that day to this, without the least shadow of evidence or foundation. In the second place, such a scene, as described above, could not possibly have happened among the "Mormons," from the fact that there is not a "Mormon" in the whole territory, but what knows that the United States' law is the supreme and highest law of the land, and that the citizens of all territories and States are amenable to it. Indeed, so great is the reverence of that people for the Federal laws, that the Legislature of that territory, during its session the past winter, has occupied the most of its time in compiling and arranging the United States' laws, applicable to territories, preparatory to publication for the information of the citizens.

The *Times* having given what it is pleased to call "the last news from Utah," says:—

"We may hope, then, now for something like a break-up of the Mormonite establishment. At present the sect professes to live under a kind of theocracy, which identifies Church and State, and places the priesthood and civil government in the same hands."

The civil government of Utah was originated by the United States. The Governor, the Judges, the Secretary, the Marshal, the United States' Attorney, and even the laws passed by the Legislature of that territory, are all under the perfect control of Congress and the Great Central Government at Washington. The United States appoint all these officers, and can approve or disapprove of any of the laws of their civil code. If any of the Priesthood has been favoured with any of these offices, it

is because the Central Government has been pleased to confer it upon them. This does not make a union of Church and State, any more than it would for the United States to confer these offices upon the Methodists, the Baptists, or any other denomination in that territory. If the United States are displeased with his Excellency Governor Young, they have the right to appoint some other man, and the territory will acquiesce with all due submission. They never have refused any appointments made by the United States, when such officers were acting in their official capacity; but the citizens of that territory are not to be humbugged into the idea that a United States' official, can come among them and commit adultery and trample upon all decency and law, without being tried for his crimes. If any have formed such an idea, they will find themselves greatly mistaken. The law is made for high as well as low; and in Utah they are lovers of virtue, of law, and of good order, and they will not suffer public prostitution, adulteries, and whoredoms to have place in the territory, without visiting such crimes with the severest penalties of the law. They have fled from Christendom, where these abominable crimes are tolerated; and they would rather die than to see the virgin soil of Utah polluted with such heart-sickening and revolting institutions.

THE LATEST FROM UTAH.—"The last accounts from Great Salt Lake represent matters in that quarter as being most unsettled, and containing a narrative of startling facts, showing that unmitigated treason, murder, arson, robbery, and forcible debauch, are every-day incidents of Mormon life, and that not an effort is made to check the perpetration of any of these terrible crimes."

Besides this, intelligence has flown through the States, crossed the Atlantic, and flapped its wings about the ears of English editors, to the effect "that a serious dissension had arisen among the Saints at Salt Lake City;" "that Brigham had been compelled to flee the City to save himself from the fury of his flock," and "that he is now, if alive, a wanderer among the Indians." But just here we will let our readers into a secret—'Tis not our latest from Utah! We have culled these "last accounts" from papers who, of course, never confess to the gift of lying, and whose editors orthodox newspaper readers believe to be specially endowed with the knowing faculties. However, we will whisper to our particular friends, the patrons of the *Star*, our conviction, that on the great record of lies, coming to light at a certain reckoning time called doomsday, there will be found a terrible sum of "last accounts."

Were we not aware of the tricks played on the public, as well as ourselves, at the "Mormons'" expense, we should possibly contract the interesting habit of pinching the outer-man to ascertain our exact state, whether we are awake, or asleep, and dreaming that we are somebody else. Or perhaps we should be tempted to believe in the doctrine of metempsychosis—in other words the transmigration of souls, and find ourselves unable to determine exactly who we are, and who other people are not. Or had we submitted ourselves to the mysterious "passes" of editors, priests, and "Own Correspondents," and felt the hallucinations of the biological power "gently e'er the senses stealing," then, as we write, Gentile society would no doubt be fitting before our eyes as a remembrance of pleasant dreams, and as we pen the name of Utah, thoughts of nightmares and goblins would frighten us from our editorial stool. But as it is, we know too much to be taken in by "last accounts;" the corruptions of Gentile society are too palpable for such pleasant dreams, and our confidence in our holy religion, and in our brethren, is too great to be disturbed by such phantoms.

We gave our "Latest from Utah," some two weeks ago, in *Star* Number 23. We thought those "last accounts" flattering. We have no doubt such was the opinion of the Saints. Instead of society there being "unsettled, and treason, mura-

der, arson, robbery, and forcible debauch" being "every day incidents of Mormon life," while "not an effort is made to check the perpetration of any of these terrible crimes," we were led to believe that *Reformation* was the "every-day incident of Mormon life."

Moreover, our advices certainly gave us to understand, that *Reformation* in the community was manifested by the Saints making restitution for any wrong done, and in forgiving each other's trespasses, and not in their murdering and robbing one another. We have no doubt our missionaries, and hundreds of the English Saints, have received this year a liberal stock of letters from their families and friends in Utah. But we have a shrewd notion that they, in that territory, were no better informed than ourselves, and are yet in happy ignorance of the horrors at home unless they have read the "last accounts" of outsiders.

But though the hoax of Brigham's flight at first proved a trap even for wide-awake editors, yet when their cooler moments came it was too palpable to them that they had been gulled. Of course, they must shuffle out of the difficulty, and hence *The Times'* "Own Correspondent," writes from New York—"The rumour is not credited here. It is believed to be a lie, set on foot by his agents to prevent the Government from sending a force this year to restore order in the territory."

Now really this explanation is as rich as the hoax itself. It must have been a "Mormon" of no mean invention, and quite original in his turn of mind, to have imagined the story of Brigham's flight. We would ask the twenty-five thousand Latter-day Saints in England, if any of them could have hit upon it? Our imagination, unaided by "Own Correspondents" is certainly not fertile enough for such an ingenious invention. The editor of *The Mormon*, one of the Twelve Apostles, and the chief "Agent" of Brigham in New York and the eastern States, seems to be as dull as ourselves in this matter. We quote the following from that paper:—

"HATS READY! HURRAH! HURRAH!! Brigham Young has been chased out of Utah! Hurrah! The Saints are in rebellion against Brigham! Hurrah!! The Mormons are divided! Hurrah!!! Make the merry bells dance, Mormonism is dead, and 'the woman on the scarlet-coloured beast' is saved!!!! Christian hypocrites, of every name and nation, shout for joy; your evil deeds will now be covered; Brigham has gone, and can expose us no more. Shout—hip, hip, hurrah! hurrah!! hurrah!!! * * * The Christian churches may be illuminated on Sunday with 'red, white, and blue' lamps and Roman candles. Don't faint over the brightness thereof. For the sake of some who may be dangerously over-joyed, we will add that this is all a hoax. President Young never stood higher in the affections of this people."

The facetious spirit of the editor is not to be misunderstood. It is too good a joke for the seriousness of any "agent" of Brigham's. We cannot pass without calling the attention of "Our Own Correspondent" of *The Times* to a few facts. They are the date of his correspondence, the 19th May, and the date of the publishing of *The Mormon*, from which the above is extracted, it was the 16th of May! Moreover, we would call his attention to the fact that the *Mormon* is published in New York, whence he writes. Now we have no objection to this same correspondent contributing to the "last accounts" from Utah, but we do think he should make himself acquainted with the views of Brigham's "agents" before taking up his official quill. This will afford another example of the policy of the doctrine—"It is better to represent ourselves, than to be represented by others."

One of the characteristics of the *Millennial Star* is generally understood by our readers to be gravity. But for the life of us, with the flight of Brigham dancing before our eyes, we could not be serious. The joke is too rich—the temptation for mirth too irresistible.

CREDIBILITY OF THE BOOK OF MORMON AS COMPARED WITH THAT OF THE BIBLE.

BY C. W. WANDELL.

*(From the "Western Standard.")**(Continued from page 366.)*

1. It is urged as an objection to the Book of Mormon, that it is nowhere mentioned in the Bible; and that, if true, it could not well be otherwise than that some mention of it would be made by that book. If this assumption could be sustained as evidence against the Book of Mormon, it would apply with equal force against the Bible itself, for Moses makes no mention of any of the future writings of the Prophets and scribes of Israel. Isaiah makes no mention of Ezekiel—Ezekiel of Zechariah—Zechariah of Matthew's Gospel—nor Matthew of the Book of Revelations. Admitting, then, that the credibility of an inspired book depends materially upon the mention made of it by divine writings previously known, and the credibility of a book being in exact ratio with the number and character of the predictions in its favour, the claims of all the books of the Bible after the Pentateuch, would fall to the ground, because there is no previous mention made of them whatever. Yet none are so irrational as to believe the Prophets or evangelists less on that account.

2. Notwithstanding that we claim the credibility of the Book of Mormon to be complete and perfect, independent of the Bible, yet we shall proceed to show that the Bible in more than one place refers to that book. As we proceed, the reader will bear in mind, that, according to the Book of Mormon, the American aborigines are mainly descended from Ephraim, the son of Joseph,—that America is the land given to Joseph in his Patriarchal blessing,—and that book is a portion of the great things of God's Law given to him, (Ephraim.)

3. *America is Joseph's land.* In Gen. xvii. 8, it is recorded that God in His blessing upon Abraham, said, "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." And to Isaac He said,

"Unto thee and unto thy seed will I give all these countries; and I will perform the oath which I swore unto Abraham thy father." In Gen. xlix. 22—26, we have the following: "Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well; whose branches run over the wall: The archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him: But his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel:) even by the God of thy father who shall help thee; and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with the blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that lieth under, blessings of the breasts and of the womb. The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors, unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills; they shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren." And in Deut. xxxiii. 13—17, Moses says, "And of Joseph he said, Blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath, and for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon, and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills, and for the precious things of the earth and fulness thereof, and for the good will of him that dwelt in the bush: let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren. His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of unicorns: with them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth: and they are the ten thousand of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh." Gén. xlviii. 15—19. "And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did

walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth. And when Joseph saw that his father laid his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, it displeased him: and he held up his father's hand, to remove it from Ephraim's head unto Manasseh's head. And Joseph said unto his father, Not so, my father: for this is the first-born; put thy right hand upon his head. And his father refused, and said, I know it my son, I know it: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations."

He must be dull indeed who cannot see the marvellous difference between the land of Canaan as the common inheritance of Israel, and *Joseph's Land* as his particular inheritance. The land of Canaan, as promised, reached from the Euphrates on the East to the Nile and Mediterranean on the West; but Joseph's blessing extended beyond those boundaries, even to the "utmost, (or farthest-off) bounds of the everlasting hills." This is plain language: and if we consider that Jacob was in Egypt when he blessed Joseph, and from thence trace geographically to the "utmost bounds," we find the American continent to be the utmost or farthest off land from that point; and being the only land situated at the "utmost bounds," it must perforce be "Joseph's land," or else there is no meaning in language, and words cease to be signs of ideas.

4. Not only is it geographically demonstrable that America is Joseph's land, but its incomparable fertility and amazing mineral wealth, is described by Moses, as before quoted, with an exactness which commands our admiration while it demonstrates his inspiration. To which of the other continents will his language apply? Or what political division of the old world possesses the "precious things" of the mineral and vegetable kingdoms to any thing like the extent and variety in which they are found in America? The language of inspiration, "Blessed of the Lord is Joseph's land," for the precious things above the surface and below the

surface, implies extraordinary richness, and applies to America only.

5. In the words of Jacob, Joseph's posterity are represented as the branches of a vine "running over the wall."

Here we inquire, What was this wall? Evidently it was the boundary of the land given to Abraham and Isaac, the land of Canaan. It is not to be supposed that Joseph's posterity would pass those limits eastwardly into a country already settled and held by powerful nations; the country southward (Arabia) was given to Ishmael, and is still held by his descendants; the land northward answered not to the description of Joseph's land; and hence we are compelled to look westward from Canaan; which doing, passing over the sea, we find the American continent answering geographically and otherwise to the inheritance of Joseph. In Ex. xiv. 22, the sea is called a "wall," and Joseph's posterity in going over the wall, simply meant going over the sea. To those who may object to this conclusion, and argue that the land of Joseph lay in the North country, and that the Ten Tribes sought that land in the days of Shalmanezzer, or some time subsequently; I reply that there is a prophecy recorded in Hosea xi. 9, 10, directly to the point; it reads thus—"I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: for I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee: and I will not enter into the city, They shall walk after the Lord: He shall roar like a lion: when he shall roar, then the children shall tremble from the west."

6. There is another peculiarity connected with God's blessing upon Ephraim the son of Joseph, which challenges consideration. He was to become "*a multitude of nations in the midst of the earth.*" Where and when has this been fulfilled in Asia, Europe, or Africa? Follow the history of Joseph's posterity to the inheritance of their portion of the common possessions of Israel; from thence to their captivity, when they were colonized with the rest of the Ten Tribes in "Halah and in Habor, by the river of Gozani, and in the cities of the Medes," from thence until history lost sight of them, the last authentic account being that they had amalgamated with the Gentile nations, and lost their identity. Hosea vii. 8, 9, and we will be forced to the conclusion,

that in no part of the eastern Continent, and at no time, has this part of Ephraim's blessing been fulfilled. But if we turn to the western Continent, we do find peoples so similar in their appearance that they are classed as of one race, and so alike in their general characteristics that a common parentage is ascribed to them, and yet with this general resemblance, they are as distinctly politically divided as are the nations of Europe. In fact no language can more forcibly describe their political situation than the language of Jacob to Ephraim, "He shall become a multitude of nations."

7. Let it not be forgotten, that Mr. Boudinot, Lord Kingsbury, Mr. J. Priest, and others, men well qualified to judge of this matter, and whose veracity and honesty are without reproach, have collected in the language, religion, traditions, manners, and customs of the American aboriginals, not a few of the clearest evidences of their Hebrew origin; the only wonder in the minds of these distinguished men being, not that the Indian in those respects resembles the Jew so little, but that, making reasonable allowance for the mutations of time, he should resemble him so much. Seeing, then, that there still remain so convincing evidences of the Israelitish origin of the Indian, and seeing that, notwithstanding our prejudices against what are to us new religious ideas, the reasonableness of the statement of the Book of Mormon, that the Western Continent is Joseph's land; with what irresistible force does the conviction strike the mind in favour of the inspiration of that volume, which makes plain to the understanding those hitherto unfathomed, yet important truths connected with the seed of Joseph, and on whose "land" was to originate, in the latter-days, that great dispensation which is to "push the people together to the ends of the earth," and in and through whom Christ will reveal himself as the Shepherd and gatherer of Israel, and the Stone or breaker of his enemies!

8. In contemplating the words of Jacob to Joseph, "From thence is the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel;" and the words of Moses, "His (Joseph's) horns are like the horns of the unicorn, with them shall he push the people together to the ends of the earth," the importance of the whole subject appears. It proves at once and beyond the power of contradiction, that

the mighty gathering "dispensation of the fulness of times," was to originate with Joseph's posterity, and, by implication, on his land. The former of these texts has sorely puzzled the Christian priests; for Christ as coming from Judah, is, by their rules of interpretation, irreconcilable with His coming from Joseph: for those rules disallow of a new dispensation. A new dispensation would call for a new revelation, which cannot be, according to their dogma, which says, "The canon of revelation is full;" yet how is it possible that Christ can be the Shepherd and Stone of Israel as coming out of Joseph, without a new revelation and dispensation? Christian priests will you answer? No! you cannot—dare not! There is little need, however, for the Nephite Prophets have already answered it. Jesus the son of Mary, of the tribe of Judah, is indeed the Shepherd and Stone of Israel, who fore-ordained that through the lineage of Joseph, and on his land the great dispensation of the latter-days should be revealed to the world. It is by the horns of Joseph's Priesthood that the people are to be pushed together. The horn is the scriptural emblem of Priesthood and power. See Hab. iii. 4, and

This higher Priesthood now to be restored,
Where stands the pontiff or the priestly
lord,

A Patriarch and Priest of God indeed,
With vested right to fill the present
need?

Which "*Bride of Christ*!" possesses for
her dower,
The hands which hold the "hiding of His
power?"

Where may we go with slightest hope to
seek,

A righteous Priest—a true Melchisedec?

9. When Jacob was about to depart this life, he said to his sons, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you what shall befall you in the last days. It was on this solemn occasion that God through him promised to Joseph, that the Shepherd and Stone should be revealed through him. That, under Christ, his posterity would be swift messengers to the nations, whose mission would be to gather up the honest-hearted, bringing them as a present of a people to the Lord of Hosts in the latter-day Zion; in which Christ not only proves himself the Shepherd or gatherer of Israel, but at the same time the Stone or breaker of His enemies; even